

**From:** [Annie Dillon](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Second Grade Standards  
**Date:** Friday, February 26, 2016 9:43:13 AM

---

My biggest concern is just the length of the English Language Arts. There seems to be an overwhelming amount to cover in one year. Also I was wondering the purpose of including the drama section? I appreciate your time on these standards.

Sent from my iPad

--

This email was Anti Virus checked by Astaro Security Gateway. <http://www.sophos.com>

From: [Eini Harris](#)  
To: [1490Comments](#)  
Subject: comments on K-5 ELA standards  
Date: Friday, February 26, 2016 10:04:50 AM  
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

---

Good morning,

After looking over the ELA standards for K-5 specifically 5<sup>th</sup> grade, I have some questions and comments.

- 1- This pertains to the writing section, the Opinion/Argumentative standard. My question is, both opinion and argumentative are two completely different formats. Are we expected to teach both? Opinion is just that, their opinion, while argumentative requires the students to be knowledgeable of both sides of an issue and state them with examples and evidence in a paper.
- 2- The same applies to the reading standards for opinion, persuasive, and argumentative. Are we to teach all three formats? Like above all three are very different. Persuasive means students are trying to persuade the reader to agree with their thinking, and they need to acknowledge there is another side within their persuasion, but prove/ sway the reader to agree with them.
- 3- A huge issue with me, for anyone concerned, is time to teach all the standards you want to implement. The way I read the standards, students in 5<sup>th</sup> grade will be required to be able to write in a full writing process framework ( preplanning, drafting, editing, revision, and publishing) a narrative fiction, a narrative nonfiction, research, an expository/ informational piece, an opinion/argumentative piece (still unsure if you expect both or just one and which one), and poetry. This is not counting the grammar and vocabulary that will eat up time from writing and reading.
- 4- I have an issue with the Mythology piece at 5<sup>th</sup> grade. What is the purpose? How is this relevant to future learning in the next grades? Is it really needed? You are going to flood educators with too many standards that some will not be taught deeply for understanding and learning. Educators will be spread too thin trying to cover all 120 plus items in 5<sup>th</sup> grade deeply in the 180 odd days we have with students. Then you look at the 6<sup>th</sup> grade and up standards and it appears they have it easy. Where is the vertical connection between grades? Where do all the standards we are going to teach apply in 6<sup>th</sup> grade?

Thank you,

*Eini Harris*

Instructional Coach  
Sedalia Middle School  
Sedalia, Mo. 65301  
[harrise@sedalia200.org](mailto:harrise@sedalia200.org)



\*Starting July 1st my new e-mail will be [harrise@sedalia200.org](mailto:harrise@sedalia200.org)  
My current e-mail [harrise@sedalia.k12.mo.us](mailto:harrise@sedalia.k12.mo.us) will be eliminated June 30th  
Currently I am checking both e-mails.

From: [Troy Lentz](#)  
To: [1490Comments](#)  
Subject: Proposed standards  
Date: Friday, February 26, 2016 11:13:37 AM

---

Weaknesses of the proposed standards.

- 1.) Lack of alignment in the ELA strands between K-5 and 6-12. Please use the same strands throughout.
- 2.) Lack of specificity in standards for grammar and mechanics in 6-12 ELA. "Conventions of standard English for commas, verb tense, and unclear pronouns" is used too often as a catch all. Please provide more specificity. Our teachers and students deserve clarity.
- 3.) Biology I should have specific course level standards, like Algebra I. Most teachers would use the life sciences strand, but it has 10 fewer standards than current Biology CLE's. Why water down the curriculum when Biology I EOC scores are consistently high?
- 4.) Adding 60 new social studies standards for elementary teachers is too much given the changes in all the other areas in one year.
- 5.) Overall, the proposed standards do not mark an improvement over the current standards. Implementing new standards in all four subjects in one year is unfair to teachers and students, particularly those in small rural districts who do not have the resources to align curriculum quickly. Gaps between the actual "taught" curriculum and the state assessed curriculum will exist while students and teachers adjust. The gaps will be disproportionately larger in districts with fewer resources. Disrupting classrooms to satisfy political pressure is unfair to students.

I shared a blog post on social media with my critique of the proposed standards which can be read here.

<http://mrtlentz.blogspot.com/2015/12/evaluating-missouris-proposed-standards.html>

Sincerely,

Troy Lentz

Middle School Principal and Curriculum Director, Harrisburg R-VIII

From: [Tobi Layton](#)  
To: [1490Comments](#)  
Subject: SS standards  
Date: Friday, February 26, 2016 11:42:21 AM

---

I am a third grade teacher who also taught fifth grade for twelve years. As I examine the proposed standards, I am concerned that switching Missouri History from 4th to 3rd grade will prove problematic for a lot of districts. Missouri history textbooks have been written with a fourth grade audience in mind. The jump in reading skills from third to fourth grade students is significant enough to warrant new texts. However, with social sciences being untested at the elementary level, there will not be money for new materials at a more appropriate reading level.

Also, I think there was a benefit to giving kids a "big picture" look at American History in the early years, then zooming in on Missouri in fourth grade, and pulling back out to delve deeper into American History in fifth grade. When students have had very little exposure to the overarching themes of our country's history, our state's history will be out of context and harder to grasp.

Furthermore, fourth grade teachers have familiarized themselves with the history of Missouri, have gathered books and developed materials to address the topic, and have years of experience in teaching it, whereas many third grade teachers have not. We as educators will step up to yet another challenge and make sure we know the content we are to teach, but I predict a major learning curve for the first several years.

--

Tobi Layton  
3rd grade teacher  
Woodland Elementary School

From: [Wynn, Kathy](#)  
To: [1490Comments](#)  
Subject: new standards  
Date: Friday, February 26, 2016 12:41:21 PM

---

While I did not review the new standards in their entirety, I did review the proposed standards for kindergarten. While I was hoping that the standards had been changed to be more developmentally appropriate for five-year-olds, I was disappointed to find more inappropriate expectations rather than less. Of most concern is the proposed requirement for kindergarten students to not only count to 100, but to do so by 2's, 5's and 10's. That is not a developmentally appropriate expectation. This makes me wonder whether anyone with expertise in early childhood development participated in the development of these proposed standards.

For the past several years our kindergarten curriculum has gotten increasingly rigorous, with kindergarten students being expected to master skills and concepts many students are not developmentally ready for. Because of this push to meet unrealistic expectations within developmentally inappropriate time frames, students are requiring years of additional intervention in order to master these skills which they may well have acquired easily if presented during a more developmentally appropriate time frame. What has happened to our kindergarten students is tragic. They need a curriculum which focuses on developing communication, social and problem solving skills within the context of facilitated activities which are hands-on and engaging, rather than unrealistic expectations and more worksheets.

Thank you,

--

Kathy Wynn, Ed.S.  
Special Education Placement Specialist

**From:** [Danielle Berning](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Social Studies Grade Level Expectations  
**Date:** Friday, February 26, 2016 12:50:12 PM

---

I have reviewed the proposed Social Studies Grade Level Expectations. I noticed that you moved most of the 4th grade Missouri History to the 3rd grade standards. I am from a small school district. I will have to try to get all new resources to be able to teach. We are already under a budget crunch along with working on our Math and ELA curriculum. Now we are going to have to throw in rewriting our science and social studies curriculum on top of these. This will not just affect me in our building, but will affect all our teachers.

Sincerely,

Danielle Berning  
4th grade teacher  
Albany Elementary Schoool



From: [Monica Hinshaw](#)  
To: [1490Comments](#)  
Subject: Proposed Standards  
Date: Friday, February 26, 2016 1:11:38 PM

---

### To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to share my concerns with you about the K-5 state standards that will soon be presented to the State Board of Education. It saddens me to think so much time was put into working on these standards. It is obvious too many opinions were combined to try and satisfy everyone. Unfortunately, pleasing everyone is NOT possible and as a result, educators across Missouri may be facing the impossible task of implementing these standards.

### ELA

I believe there are TOO MANY standards in ELA! They are too specific. Many of them could be combined or done away with. As an elementary principal and past veteran 1st grade teacher, I believe the emphasis of most ELA standards should be on the foundational reading skills in grades K-3. - phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, and fluency. K-3rd grade students are "learning to read," and 4th grade+ students are "reading to learn." Therefore, the emphasis should move from foundational skills to comprehension as students get older. The proposed ELA standards are my greatest concern, and I HOPE they will NOT BE APPROVED in their current state. Please consider working on them more! Missouri can do better for our students!

### MATH

In the standards for Kindergarten and 2nd grade, under Relationships and Algebraic Thinking, the terms "sums" and "differences" are used (K.R.A.A.1, K.R.A.A.2, and 2.R.A.A.1). Please use "addition" and "subtraction" to make them consistent with 1st grade standards in the same section. 1.R.A.C.2 switches to sums and differences, too. Again, consistency is important. On a positive note, I like using the word "demonstrate" v. "understand" in K and 1 standards.

### SOCIAL STUDIES

I wish the Missouri history would stay in the 4th grade standards rather than move to 3rd grade.

I have not had enough time to look at the Science standards adequately. I will comment on them when I have more time.

--

Monica Hinshaw

Principal

*North Shelby Elementary*

**A candle loses nothing when it gives its light to another wick.**



From: [Heather Christine](#)  
To: [1490Comments](#)  
Subject: Proposed standards  
Date: Friday, February 26, 2016 1:58:03 PM

---

To Whom it May Concern:

I am very concerned with the proposed standards. The number of standards in ELA alone per grade level is beyond ridiculous. With a school year averaging 175 days in the year, there are nearly enough standards to teach one standard A DAY, and of course that would at all be mastered in one day's time. I cannot believe you would seriously propose such a ludicrous amount of standards to be met. It should be obvious that the amount is far too high and the standards should have been condensed and generalized better. I haven't even hardly begun digging into these and already I'm at a loss for how ridiculous these are. Some standards are far TOO SPECIFIC, especially in science and need to be generalized. Some areas are just crazy for the grade level for example identifying different regions in second grade based on the wheat producing region and business district? This is above a second grader's understanding and not necessary. I agree with being able to say urban versus rural, but seriously, the wheat producing region?? How many of you all in Jefferson City can show me that, let alone a second grader?! I sincerely hope these are reconsidered as they are in DESPERATE need of FIXING. If these are approved you are doing a DISSERVICE TO EDUCATORS AND STUDENTS IN MISSOURI.

--

**Heather R. Christine**  
Second Grade- North Shelby Elementary  
[heatherc@nshelby.k12.mo.us](mailto:heatherc@nshelby.k12.mo.us)

**From:** [Sherry Sharp](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on the updated proposed math Missouri Learning Standards  
**Date:** Friday, February 26, 2016 2:37:11 PM

---

My name is Sherry Sharp, I am a high school math teacher in the Carl Junction R-1 school district. I have been teaching secondary math for 20 years and hold a bachelor's degree in math education and a master's degree in mathematics.

My initial impression of the updated proposed math standards is extreme shock at the early ages we are asking our children to be exposed to advanced mathematical topics. There seems to be an obvious vertical shift in topics starting at the Algebra 1 level and continuing until Kindergarten. I am concerned at the content required of K-5 when young minds may not be mature enough to fully absorb the concept presented to them.

My specific comments to the document will be isolated to the Algebra 1, Algebra 2 and Geometry sections.

1. The document was easy to read and understand. The coding used was also easy to read and understand.
2. I agree with the proposed Geometry section at the high school level.
3. NQA3 should be in the Algebra 1 section.
4. SSEA3b "complete the square" should be an Algebra 2 topic.
5. CEDA should be split into Linear and Quadratic in Algebra 1 and Exponential in Algebra 2.
6. REIA2 should be in the Algebra 2 section.
7. REIB2 Quadratic should be in the Algebra 2 section.
8. REIC Exponential should be in the Algebra 2 section.
9. IFB and IFC should limit Algebra 1 to Linear and Quadratic, Exponential should be moved to Algebra 2
10. LQEA Exponential topics should be in the Algebra 2 section.
11. LQEB Geometric sequences should be in the Algebra 2 section.
12. EEIA1 8<sup>th</sup> grade should be moved to Algebra 1.
13. EEIB2 8<sup>th</sup> grade should be moved to Algebra 1.
14. EEIC2 8<sup>th</sup> grade should be moved to Algebra 1.
15. FA and FB 8<sup>th</sup> grade should be moved to Algebra 1.

Thank you for your time.

Sherry Sharp  
Carl Junction High School  
Carl Junction, Missouri

From: [Carri Hutchinson](#)  
To: [1490Comments](#)  
Subject: Comment about proposed standards  
Date: Friday, February 26, 2016 2:42:03 PM

---

We would like to see examples for each standard in all areas. We have a common core standards and strategies flip chart for our specified grade level. We use this a lot for reference. Please see attachment.  
Thank you!

Carri Hutchinson  
1st Grade Teacher

From: [Ron Owrey](#)  
To: [1490Comments](#)  
Subject: Proposed Standards  
Date: Friday, February 26, 2016 2:46:57 PM

---

As a Missouri Educator for thirty-three years, I am completely dumbfounded by the proposed Missouri Standards. There are too many standards per grade level in ELA. Moving Missouri State History to third grade, in my opinion, is a mistake. Teachers across the state have spent time, effort and their own financial resources to develop this unit of study. I can't understand the reasoning for the reconfiguration of many of the standards. It appears to me since there are so many standards in ELA, they were just added to make everyone happy. I noticed in fifth grade one standard was to alphabetize a list of words to the first letter. As a fifth grade teacher, we already are alphabetizing to the third letter. I do not feel these standards are ready to be presented and need a lot of additional work. Hopefully, with additional time and common sense, the standards can be streamlined to benefit the students of our state.

Ron Owrey  
5/6 Grade ELA

From: [Seth Woods](#)  
To: [1490Comments](#)  
Subject: Comments on K-5 Math Standards  
Date: Friday, February 26, 2016 3:02:27 PM

---

Good afternoon,

I am a high school mathematics teacher. As of today, I have reviewed the draft of the K-5 Mathematics standards. I have just a few areas of constructive criticism:

- 1) I am concerned in the Number Sense and Operations in Fractions that there is not enough guidance on what denominators are expected to be studied in Grade 3. Without that guidance, the list of denominators studied in Grade 4 could become overwhelming for students and their teachers.
- 2) I believe more specificity is needed with regard to fractions greater than 1 in the Number Sense and Operations in Fractions section. For example, in standard 5.NF.C.3, it is stated that students will Solve problems involving addition and subtraction of fractions and mixed numbers with unlike denominators, and justify solutions. My concern is that this standard does not specify whether problems that involve improper fractions, like  $2\frac{1}{2} + 1\frac{2}{3}$ , are expected as a part of this standard. In fact, improper fractions were not addressed at all in the K-5 standards. I suppose my question is more about whether problems that would require the use of improper fractions to solve would be included in this standard, and, if not, when do they fit in the standards (I glanced through the grades 6-8 standards and did not see them mentioned). I believe improper fractions should be explicitly named in the standards so teachers know when to incorporate them, particularly because mixed numbers are so infrequently used in the upper grades.
- 3) Standard 4.GM.B.1 has a typo. "Identify" should be identify.
- 4) I am VERY concerned that the standards for mathematical practice that were included in the Common Core standards appear to have been left out of this draft. If we return to just emphasizing a list of skills, we are perpetuating the view of mathematics as solely an answer-getting process instead of keeping a sharp focus on the benefits of students being able to understand mathematics and justify their reasoning. I understand that any individual teacher could still emphasize those skills, but including the practice standards in the Missouri Learning Standards makes them a priority for everyone.

Thank you,

Seth Woods

From: [Brown, Dawn](#)  
To: [1490Comments](#)  
Subject: MO Learning Standards Revision  
Date: Friday, February 26, 2016 3:17:41 PM  
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

---

I am looking at the standards in High School Geometry.

<b>CO</b>	
<b>C</b>	<b>Prove geometric theorems.</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Prove theorems about lines and angles.</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Prove theorems about triangles.</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Prove theorems about polygons.</b>



<b>CO</b>	
<b>D</b>	<b>Make geometric constructions.</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Construct geometric figures.</b>

It says prove theorems about lines and angles. That is a very general statement. It would be nice to know what theorems students are expected to prove. Such as vertical angles are congruent.

What type of proof are you expecting from students? For instance can they be informal proofs, paragraph proofs, two-column proofs, or flow proofs.

What do you want students to prove about triangles? The sum of the angles is 180 degrees, base angles of an isosceles triangles are congruent, the angle bisector of a isosceles triangle is the bisector and perpendicular to the base.

What should students be able to prove about polygons? The sum of the interior angles, the area formula for regular polygons, the exterior angles have a measure of 360 degrees.

What figures do you want students to construct? Equilateral triangle, hexagon, and square. Using a compass and straight edge or using technology.

Those are a few of my concerns looking at the geometry standard.

Thank you,

Dawn Brown

This email and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information for the use of the designated recipients named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error. State and federal laws prohibit the review or distribution of communications received in error. If you have received this communication in error, please notify Sikeston Public Schools at (573) 472-2581 and destroy all copies of the email and any attachments.



From: [Kelli Compton](#)  
To: [1490Comments](#)  
Subject: New Learning Standards  
Date: Friday, February 26, 2016 4:15:26 PM

---

Dear Sir or Madam:

With little confidence that my thoughts/comments will make a difference, I am still taking the time to write and let my voice be heard along with the many MANY others whom have NO idea why our state would even consider changing our learning standards again. I am completely perplexed by this decision (assuming it is passed on the 15th of March) to once again cause us - the teachers - to have to spend endless hours rewriting curriculum - and this time, not even believing in/supporting the new standards. We have worked tirelessly the past two years writing and rewriting curriculum for the Missouri Learning Standards.....and for what.....to now have to look at that mountain of work before us yet AGAIN?

The new standards are simply a ridiculous requirement for Missouri teachers. We have given our blood, sweat, and tears trying to get new lesson plans/curriculum written for THIS school year, thinking we would have NEXT year to improve/tweak them, after teaching them once. Now, you would have us start from square one? I honestly don't know if I have it in me.....and I know I speak for a large number, if not all teachers that are facing this.

I hope you will reconsider adopting these new standards. We will never perfect something that we are unable to work on for any length of time. If we were allowed to use the same standards/lessons/curriculum for several years, before you change them, we might actually see some growth and progress in our students' learning and test scores. We switch things around on them so much, they never have a chance to do any real quality learning. Another reason for this is that we are so busy trying to keep up with the writing of the curriculum.....every lesson plan.....every worksheet.....every assessment.....every book we use.....that our instructing suffers due to lack of time to invest in our actual job of being a TEACHER. I didn't go to college to write curriculum. I went to teach our children. A job I used to love.